

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the Final Office action dated May 30, 2007 and the references it cites. By way of this Response, claims 30 and 31 have been amended, claims 29, 52-54, 56, and 57 have been canceled without prejudice to their further prosecution and claim 73 has been added. In view of the following, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 29-31, 52-54, 56, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Overholt et al., U.S. Patent 5,435,108 (hereinafter Overholt), where claims 29, 52-54, 56, and 57 are now canceled. Thus, the rejections are largely moot. Nevertheless, to assist the Examiner in completing the examination, although independent claim 73 is new, Applicants offer the following comments on how the claim defines over Overholt, which was relied on heavily in all previous Office actions.

Independent claim 73 relates generally to a door comprising a first door panel and an actuation system coupled to the first door panel to render the first door panel horizontally movable relative to the doorway. The claim specifies that the first door panel includes, *inter alia*, a resilient core, a flexible fabric covering that at least partially covers the resilient core, and a plurality of adjacent relatively rigid segments interposed between the resilient core and the flexible fabric covering. Further, claim 73 also recites that the first door panel is able to substantially recover its relaxed shape after an impact causes appreciable distortion in the first door panel and that the plurality of relatively

rigid segments have a rigidity greater than the rigidity of the resilient core and the flexible fabric covering.

Overholt does not teach, or suggest a door that includes an actuation system coupled to the first door panel to render the first door panel horizontally movable relative to the doorway. In contrast, Overholt describes “[a]n overhead garage door panel” with an actuation system that renders its door panels vertically movable relative the doorway, between a lower, closed position and an open position, in which the door is stored substantially “overhead.” Overholt’s garage door is mounted “between a pair of generally parallel tracks 14” that “enable the garage door 10 to be slidably moved . . .” (col. 3, ll. 43-47). Overholt makes no accommodation for a horizontally moving door panel, instead teaching an actuation system (torsion spring 18 or counterbalance, pulley 22 tracks 14) that renders its garage door vertically movable relative to the doorway.

Furthermore, Overholt does not teach, or suggest a door panel that includes a flexible fabric covering that at least partially covers a resilient core. In contrast, Overholt describes a “metal outer skin 26 . . . [that] is fabricated from roll formed hot dipped galvanized steel . . .” (col. 4, ll. 48-50). Overholt also discloses that the back skin 50 “is preferably made from plastic film, paper film, Kraft paper, or thin sheet metal such as steel or foil” (col. 4, ll. 66-68), where “back skin 50 preferably adds structural strength to the door panel 42” (col. 5, ll. 3-4). Overholt does not teach, or suggest a door panel with a flexible fabric covering that at least partially covers a resilient core, as recited in claim 73.

Finally, because Overholt discloses a door panel with a metal outer skin 26 and a back skin 50 that adds structural strength, it is doubtful that the door panel would be able

to substantially recover its relaxed shape after the impact causes appreciable distortion in the first door panel, as recited in claim 73. Instead, the “covering” materials (metal or another “structural” material) disclosed by Overholt are likely to deform permanently if subjected to an impact of even modest force and, thus would be unable to recover a relaxed shape.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 73 is patentable over Overholt and the other prior art of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 73 and all claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request such allowance.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dated: **November 29, 2007**

_____/James A. Flight/
James A. Flight
Reg. No. 37,622
Attorney for Applicant
(312) 580-1020